

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00275 190004Z

10  
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 PM-07 NSC-10 SPC-03 SS-20 RSC-01

CIAE-00 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 PRS-01

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 OMB-01 MC-02 DRC-01

/134 W

----- 020418

R 182225Z JAN 74  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3641  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT  
CINCLANT  
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS  
AMEMBASSY OSLO  
AMEMBASSY PARIS  
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE  
AMEMBASSP COPENHAGEN

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 0275

E.O. 11652: GDS-12-31-80  
TAGS: MCAP, NATO  
SUBJECT: PRESENTATION OF SACEUR'S FORCE PROPOSALS TO DPC JANUARY 18

ERF: A. OSLO 230 (NOTAL)  
B. USNATO 254 (NOTAL)

SUMMARY. ON JANUARY 18, SHAPE PRESENTED SACEUR'S FORCE PROPOSALS  
1975 TO 1980 TO DPC. FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION CENTERED ON FINDING  
WAYS TO ASSURE THAT FORCE PROPOSALS/FORCE GOALS PROCESS RESULTS  
IN IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGH PRIORITY FORCE IMPROVEMENTS. PERMREPS  
STRESSED NEED FOR STANDARDIZATION AND INTEROPERABILITY. END SUMMARY.

1. DPC RECEIVED PRESENTATION ON SACEUR'S 1975 TO 1980 FORCE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00275 190004Z

PROPOSALS. PRESENTATION STRESSED PROPOSALS ARE BASED ON  
MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE AND AD-70 ESTABLISHED PRIORITIES, AND THAT  
MAIN EMPHASIS OF PROPOSALS IS ON QUALITATIVE IMPROVEMENTS, WITH  
SOME SELECTIVE QUANTITATIVE IMPROVEMENTS. IN SHAPE VIEW,

PROPOSALS ARE NOT A "WISH LIST." PRESENTATION ALSO CREDITED NATO IMPROVEMENTS TO DATE IN TANK, ANTI-TANK, ASW, AIRLIFT AND AIR DEFENSE AREAS.

2. SYG LUNS OPENED DISCUSSION BY REFERRING TO RUMSFELD'S (US) REMARKS FOLLOWING JANUARY 17 PRESENTATIONS OF SACLANT'S AND CINCHAN'S PROPOSALS THAT FORCE PROPOSALS/FORCE GOALS PROCEDURE IS GOOD FOR PLANNING, BUT NOT FOR INSURING IMPLEMENTATION. SYG LUNS SAID DPC SHOULD REFLECT ON HOW TO PUT MORE TEETH INTO THE PROCESS. RUMSFELD RECALLED HIS JANUARY 17 COMMENT THAT AS ALLIES HAVE SEEN IN DISCUSSION NATO DECLARATION ATLANTIC RELATIONS HAVE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY OVER PAST 25 YEARS, THAT DETENTE WAS PLACING INCREASING PRESSURES ON DEFENSE BUDGETS, AND THUS NATO NO LONGER CAN AFFORD LUXURY OF ASSORTED TYPES OF SAME WEAPON SYSTEM, AND LACK OF INOPERABILITY AND STANDARDIZATION. NATO COUNTRIES MUST IMPLEMENT THE LESS COSTLY FORCE PROPOSALS; STANDARDIZATION IS NOT JUST DESIRABLE TODAY BUT A NECESSITY IN VIEW OF BUDGET PRESSURES.

3. PECK(UK) ASKED FOR ORDER OF MAGNITUDE COSTS OF THOSE PRIORITY I PROPOSALS NOT IN CURRENT COUNTRY PLANS, AND WHETHER SHAPE STUDIES HAD HIGHLIGHTED PRIORITIES AREAS MERITING EXTRA ATTENTION, PERHAPS AT EXPENSE OF OTHER PRIORITIES. SACEUR REP SAID SHAPE DOES NOT YET KNOW WHICH FORCE PROPOSALS WILL BE ACCEPTED BY COUNTRIES; THUS IT COULD NOT ESTIMATE AGGREGATE COSTS AT THIS TIME. HE VOLUNTEERED THAT SHAPE MIGHT BE ABLE TO GIVE ADVISE TO COUNTRIES DURING DEVELOPMENT OF FORCE GOALS AS TO COMPENSATORY MEASURES WHICH MIGHT BE TAKEN AT LOWER FUNDING LEVELS. HOWEVER, HE REITERATED DESIRE FOR ACROSS-THE-BOARD EMPHASIS ON ALL PRIORITY I PROPOSALS; SHAPE DOES NOT FAVOR CONCENTRATION ON ONE PRIORITY AT EXPENSE OF ANOTHER.

4. DE STAERCKE(BELGIUM) SAID STANDARDIZATION IS AS MUCH A POLITICAL PROBLEM AS A MILITARY ONE. HE CITED FIERCE INDUSTRY COMPETITION AND WONDERED WHETHER MILITARY COULD HELP POLITICAL AUTHORITIES RESOLVE DILEMMA BY PROVIDING PRECISE ADVISE AS TO REQUIRED CHARACTERISTICS FOR SPECIFIC WEAPON SYSTEMS, LIKE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00275 190004Z

REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT FOR F-104. HE ADDED NATO HAS INTEGRATION, NOT STANDARDIZATION, AND IN SOME CASES, BECUASE OF DOMESTIC PRESSURES, EVEN MINISTERS CAN'T MAKE PROCUREMENT DECISIONS. SHAPE EXPRESSED SUPPORT FOR STANDARDIZATION BUT POINTED OUT THAT FINAL PROCUREMENT DECISIONS ARE STILL UP TO NATIONS. DE STAERCKE ALSO CHIDED SHAPE FOR CRITICIZING REDUCTIONS IN CONSCRIPTION SERVICE. HE SAID REDUCTIONS ARE A POLITICAL REALITY AND ASKED WHETHER SHAPE SHOULD NOT BE RECOMMENDING PROFESSIONALIZATION OF MILITARY SERVICES. HE NOTED U.K. AND U.S. HAD RESOLVED CONSCRIPT PROBLEM BY GOING TO AN ALL REGULAR FORCES. SYG LUNS WONDERED IF COUNTRIES WOULD BE WILLING TO PAY THE ADDITIONAL COSTS TO SUPPORT AN ALL PROFESSIONAL FORCE.

5. BUSCH (NORWAY) POINTED TO EUROGROUP DISCUSSION OF REPLACEMENT FOR F-104, AND INFORMED DPC THAT NORWEGIAN MOD, CURRENT EUROGROUP CHAIRMAN, HAS SENT LETTERS TO BELGIAN, DANISH, AND DUTCH MODS URGING HIGH LEVEL MEETING TO DISCUSS JOINT PROCUREMENT OF F-104 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT (SEE OSLO 230).

6. RUMSFELD (US) EMPHASIZED THAT COUNTRIES ARE CONTINUING TO PROCURE SYSTEMS WHICH LACK INTEROPERABILITY, CITING A RECENT COMMUNICATIONS BUY AS AN EXAMPLE. COMMENT. RUMSFELD HAD IN MIND REPORTED RECENT BELGIAN DECISION TO PROCURE FRENCH TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM "RITA"; A SYSTEM WHICH IS NOT COMPATIBLE WITH STANDARDS ADOPTED BY EUROGROUP. END COMMENT. HE SAID TOTAL PACKAGE OF NC PROPOSALS IS TOO BIG FOR DPC TO DIGEST IN A MEANINGFUL MANNER, AND THAT PROPOSALS DO NOT PROVIDE CLEAR ENOUGH LINKAGE BETWEEN MILITARY REQUIREMENTS AND POLITICAL DECISIONS NEEDED TO MOVE IN DIRECTION OF THE POLITICALLY DIFFICULT BUT LOWER COST FORCE IMPROVEMENTS. HE ADDED PROPOSALS SHOULD BE CLEAR ENOUGH TO FORCE POLITICAL LEVEL TO MAKE THE TOUGH DECISIONS. HE CITED NEED TO BRING FULL WEIGHT OF ALLIANCE TO BEAR ON THE POLITICAL DESIGN MAKING PROCESS TO ACHIEVE PROGRESS TOWARD INTEROPERABILITY AND STANDARDIZATION. RUMSFELD ALSO REITERATED THAT THOSE FORCE PROPOSALS WHICH OFFER MILITARY IMPROVEMENTS WITHOUT SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN COSTS SHOULD BE HIGHLIGHTED.

7. SHAPE AGREED THAT CONCERTED EFFORT WAS NEEDED TO COORDINATE FUTURE PROCUREMENT PLANS AND SUGGESTED PROPER FORUM WAS EXISTING CNAD. ASYG FOR DEFENSE SUPPORT (TUCKER) SAID NATO'S RECORD ON CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 00275 190004Z

STANDARDIZATION AND INTEROPERABILITY LEAVES MUCH TO BE DESIRED, AND AGREED PROPER MECHANISM WAS CNAD AND ITS SUBGROUPS. TUCKER SAID CNAD SHOULD MAKE GREATER EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY POLITICAL ACTIONS NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT FORCE IMPROVEMENTS AND ADVANTAGES ACCRUED FROM STANDARDIZATION. HE ENCOURAGED UPGRADING OF NATIONAL CNAD REPRESENTATION AS A MEANS OF BRINGING PROBLEMS TO HIGHEST LEVELS OF GOVERNMENTS.  
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 18 JAN 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO00275  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS-12-31-80  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740173/abbryssk.tel  
**Line Count:** 150  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2002 by kellew0>; APPROVED <29 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** PRESENTATION OF SACEUR'S FORCE PROPOSALS TO DPC JANUARY 18  
**TAGS:** MCAP, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT  
CINCLANT  
BRUSSELS  
OSLO

PARIS  
THE HAGUE  
AMEMBASSP COPENHAGEN

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005